

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

A proposed correction for Figure 1 and Figure 2 is submitted herewith labeling these figures “Prior Art” in response to the Examiner’s objection.

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-20 have been canceled and claims 21-40 have been added. Thus, claims 21-40 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The specification has been carefully reviewed and revised in order to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements to aid the Examiner's further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added. Also attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned "**Version with Markings to Show Changes Made.**"

In item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to because the specification recites a protruding electrode 2B and the figures show a protruding electrode terminal. By the amendment to the specification contained herein, the specification has been amended throughout to recite a protruding electrode terminal.

In items 2 and 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 10 is objected to because of informalities. In view of the cancellation of claim 10, this objection is now believed moot. Furthermore, new claims 21-40 have been drafted so as to avoid the informalities of claim 10.

In item 4 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to because Figures 1 and 2 illustrate only that which is old, but are not labeled as "Prior Art." In response, a proposed drawing correction for Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 is submitted herewith so as to label Figs. 1 and 2 "Prior Art". Approval of the proposed drawing is respectfully requested, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner indicate approval of the proposed correction in the next Office Action.

Next, in items 5-8 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. These rejections are now believed moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-20; furthermore, new claims 21-40 have been drafted so as to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and to specifically address the

Examiner's concerns. Therefore it is submitted that the Examiner's formal rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are not applicable to the new claims. In particular, it is submitted that the new claims are clearly directed to a battery pack, and not the method of making the battery pack.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Katsuhiko KAWABATA et al.

By: 
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No.40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 11, 2007